[24th January 1933

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" When the Government thought fit to take cognizance of representations made by private individuals, may I know what prevented them from consulting the district board concerned? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" District boards are in no case consulted in regard to the postponement of elections."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if it is a fact that until the date was extended, there was no claim petition received? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" As stated in the report I read out, at the request of both parties the date has been extended. First the date for filing claims was extended and afterwards, when a large number of claims were received, it was found necessary to extend the time."

Postponement of the elections to the local boards in the Kistna district.

* 468 *Q.*—Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Kistna is the only district in which elections to the local boards are not yet held;

(*b*) whether in respect of the Kistna district local boards elections, the period for receiving claims and objections has been extended from 15th November 1932 to 1st December 1932 and again to 10th December 1932, and the period for publication of final roll of voters has been extended from 4th December 1932 to 22nd December 1932, and then to 3rd January 1933 and again to 10th January 1933; and

(*c*) why so many extensions have been made ?

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*b*) The period for publication of claims and objections has been last extended up to 10th January 1933 and that for the publication of the final electoral roll up to the 28th February 1933.

(*c*) A change of the District Election Officer and the receipt of about 80,000 claims for and objections to the inclusion in the electoral registers of taluks (except Gudivada) contribute to the delay in the publication of the final roll. Some twenty to thirty thousand claims and objections are also expected to be filed in the Gudivada taluk.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if any claims and petitions were received before the first extension of the date? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" I had not asked for that information in the report. I presume that some claims might have been received before the first extension. Owing to the large number of claims and objections the parties wanted to present, they asked for extension."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" In view of the large number of claims filed and in view of the fact that the date has been fixed as

24th January 1933]

28th February for the publication of the electoral rolls, will the hon. Minister take the necessary steps to see that all the claims are disposed of before then and that what he has undertaken is carried out? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I would see that the necessary steps are taken to dispose of the claims and objections in time."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" When was the claim of the Raja of Mirzapuram made? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I have no information."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Was it before or after the hon. the Chief Minister took office? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I think it was before I took office."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I know whether the Government would act as in the case of the Kistna district if similar objections are received on similar occasions in respect of other districts? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" If any representation is made and the Government feel that it is worthy of consideration, they will consider."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Do the Government feel that the petitions filed by the Rajas of Mirzapuram and Chellapalli are reasonable and that they should interfere? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" Yes, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Were the representations of the Rajas of Chellapalli and Mirzapuram made simultaneously? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" No."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Whose was received earlier? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I cannot say."

Exemption of the Motor lorries owned by the Burmah-Shell Company from the levy of fees by the Local Boards and Municipalities.

* 469 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Government orders have been sent to local boards and municipalities directing them not to levy fees for the petrol and oil lorries owned by the Burmah-Shell Company running in the mufassal stations;

(*b*) whether such order is in conformity with the provisions of the several Acts relating thereto;

(*c*) what the special reasons are which actuated the Government in issuing such orders;

(*d*) how many such lorries are being run in this Presidency both by the Burmah-Shell Company and other petrol companies;